

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed June 16, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Double Patenting Rejections - Obviousness-type Double Patenting

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable in view of claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/630,878 ("the '878 application").

As indicated above, remaining independent claim 1 has been amended through this Response. In view of that amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10 of the '878 application do not render claim 1 and its dependents unpatentable. Applicant therefore requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 5-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter.

In response to the rejection, Applicant has canceled claims 5-8. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kemp, et al.* ("Kemp," U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0078160).

As indicated above, remaining independent claim 1 has been amended through this Response. In view of that amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are moot as having been drawn against Applicant's claims in a previous form. Applicant therefore requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Turning to the merits of claim 1, Applicant notes that Kemp at least does not disclose "a digital printer establishing a closed-loop communication link between the designer location and the print service provider location", "the digital printer sending current configuration information stored within memory of the digital printer to the designer location via the closed-loop communication link", or "creating a press ready file at the designer location using the current configuration information received from the digital printer via the closed-loop communication link". Specifically, Kemp is silent as to a digital printer providing configuration information stored within its memory to a designer location, thereby enabling the designer location to create the press ready file accordingly.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kemp*.

As identified above, Kemp does not teach aspects of Applicant's claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that remaining dependant claim 3 is allowable over the Kemp for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable over Kemp.

V. Canceled Claims

Claims 5-9 have been canceled from the application without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to present these canceled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequently.


VI. New Claims

Claims 11-20 have been added into the application through this Response. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims describe an invention novel and unobvious in view of the prior art of record and, therefore, respectfully requests that these claims be held to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



David R. Risley
Registration No. 39,345